

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

The Office Action mailed March 24, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-11 and 14-22 were pending in the application. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-11 and 14-22 are pending in the application and submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Prior Art Rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese document 10-191453 (hereafter “JP ‘453”) in view of U.S. patent 5,197,009 to Hoffman, Jr., et al. (hereafter “Hoffman”). Claims 3-8, 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over JP ‘453 in view of Hoffman and further in view of U.S. patent 6,324,467 to Michii et al. Claims 9-11 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over JP ‘453 in view of Hoffman and further in view of U.S. patent application publication US 2001/0056443 to Takayama et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1 and 14 recite, *inter alia*, that a printer prints a map image on a recording medium based on the map data when the user ID is inputted to the server through the printer. This recited feature is not disclosed or suggested by any of the applied references. This claimed feature is supported by the originally filed specification at page 12, lines 13 to 25 as well as figure 7, for example.

Specifically, the JP ‘453 only discloses that the document data is transferred to the designated printer where it is printed out. See last 3 lines of the SOLUTION section of the Abstract of JP ‘453. Likewise, Hoffman is directed to making it easy for delivery persons to pick up a map at a store and deliver to a customer from that store. There is no teaching or suggestions in either of these references (or their reasonable combination) of all the recited features in the independent claims which require that a desired destination data is transmitted

to a server by a user using a portable terminal where it is associated with a user ID of the user such that the user can conveniently retrieve a printed map from the location of the printer to the desired destination simply by entering the user ID at the printer. This feature provides the advantages that it solves the problems identified on page 3, last paragraph and page 4, first paragraph of the specification. Therefore, neither these claimed features nor their advantages are provided by the applied prior art.

These deficiencies of JP '453 and Hoffman are not cured by any of the other applied references. Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* of obviousness with respect to the pending claims.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable subject matter when considered as a whole.

For example, the dependent claims 2 and 15 recite features that allow the claimed system to function so that the map data useful to the user can be accurately generated and transmitted. None of the applied references disclose this particular combination and therefore, these features provide additional reasons for the patentability of these claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 24, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5414
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888
Aaron C. Chatterjee
Registration No. 41,398
Attorneys for Applicants